

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

To: Planning Commission

From: Technical Committee

Staff Contacts: Rob Odle, Director of Planning and Community Development, 425-556-2417, rodle@redmond.gov

Cathy Beam, AICP, Principal Planner, 425-556-2429, cbeam@redmond.gov

Jeff Churchill, Assistant Planner, 425-556-2492, jchurchill@redmond.gov

Date: July 13, 2007

File Number: L070094, L070095 (SEPA)

Recommended Action:

- Land-use change from Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park to Design District
- Zone change from RA-5, R-6, and BP to Bear Creek Design District (BCDD)
- Adoption of proposed Bear Creek Design District Regulations, as shown in Exhibit A
- Repealing of regulations in 20C.70.15, Bear Creek Neighborhood Regulations, and reserving of division for future neighborhood regulations.

**Reasons the Proposal
Should be Adopted:**

- The proposal is consistent with LU-59, which describes the purpose of Design Districts
- It is consistent with land-use policies directing growth away from environmentally critical areas.

- It is consistent with policies of the Shoreline Master Program and Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan that direct the City to protect the Bear and Evans Creeks stream and wetland corridors.
- It provides an opportunity to allow relocation of that portion of Evans Creek that is currently confined in a narrow industrialized channel, consistent with the Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) 8 Salmon Recovery Plan.
- It provides opportunities to develop senior housing, consistent with City housing policy calling for a variety of housing types.
- It advances the vision of the Bear and Evans Creek Trail and Greenway System.
- It incorporates onsite employee housing, reducing commuting needs, consistent with City transportation policies.

I. APPLICANT PROPOSAL

A. APPLICANT

Aegis Living, represented by Steve McCullagh.

B. BACKGROUND AND REASON FOR PROPOSAL

Location: Generally east of Avondale Road, north of the Millennium office park, south of the Friendly Village mobile homes, and west of City-owned wetland areas. See Exhibit C for a visual representation.

Site size: Approximately 125 acres

Parcel #s: All or portions of 012505-9021, -9051, -9130, -9131, -9181, -9182; and 062506-9013, -9035, -9066, -9151, and a small area of public right-of-way.

The applicant proposes to amend the Comprehensive Plan Land-Use Map to change the land-use designation for the referenced properties from Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park to Design District, and to amend the Zoning Map to change the affected properties from RA-5, R-6, and BP to Bear Creek Design District (BCDD), a new zoning designation.

The applicant cites several reasons for pursuing the Plan amendment, among which are to:

- Allow the development of retirement residences and associated services, such as medical, financial, and social services, responding to a need for additional senior housing in Redmond;
- Provide onsite affordable employee housing to enable hiring from the local community and reduce commute trips from what would otherwise be expected; and,
- Permanently protect the majority of the property for passive recreation, trails, open space, and wetland mitigation banking, consistent with state and local policies and regulations.

II. RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee recommends approval of the following:

- Land-use designation change from Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park to Design District
- Zone change from RA-5, R-6, and BP to Bear Creek Design District (BCDD)
- Adoption of the proposed Bear Creek Design District regulations (Exhibit A)
- Repealing of existing Bear Creek neighborhood regulations and reserving of 20C.70.15 for future neighborhood regulations

III. ALTERNATIVES

1. Endorse the Technical Committee's recommendation amending the Land-Use and Zoning Maps, creating regulations for the BCDD, and repealing existing Bear Creek neighborhood regulations.
2. Recommend no change to existing land-use designations, zones, and zoning regulations.
3. Recommend a modified version of the proposal.

IV. SUPPORTING ANALYSIS: FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Land-use designation. The site's current land-use designations are Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park. The site's current zoning designations are RA-5 (one unit per five acres) and R-6 (six units per acre), and BP. The RA-5 designation covers about 118.0 acres of the site, the R-6 designation 2.7 acres, and the BP designation 4.0 acres. The underlying zone designations would permit a total of 40 residential lots. The current Bear Creek Neighborhood regulations contain bonus

provisions that allow for development of 210 residential units on 35 acres in the northwest portion of the site, plus five more units on the site not currently owned by the Kellers.

Land-use. The majority of the site consists of a farm, wetlands, riparian corridors, and open space. The northwest portion of the site contains a produce stand and one single-family residence at 9004 Avondale Road (see Exhibit C).

Adjacent uses.

- North: single-family homes zoned R-6.
- South: Millennium office park, City-owned open space, single-family home, and vacant commercial land.
- West: multi-family residential homes in R-12 and R-20 zones, one single-family home, and office buildings in the far southwest corner.
- East: City-owned park land and a construction-related business.

B. COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA FOR AMENDMENTS

Redmond Comprehensive Plan Policies PI-16, LU-24 and LU-9 direct the City to take into account several considerations, as applicable, as part of decisions on proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Guide.

Items 1 through 6 apply to all proposed amendments. Items 7 through 10 apply when proposed amendments concern allowed land uses or densities, such as proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan Map, land-use designations, allowed land uses, or zoning map.

The following is an analysis of how this proposal complies with the requirements for amendments.

1. Consistency with Growth Management Act (GMA), State of Washington Department of Community Trade and Economic Development Procedural Criteria, VISION 2020 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.

The proposed amendment is consistent with provisions in the state Growth Management Act, Countywide Planning Policies for King County, and VISION 2020 that call for directing urban growth to urban areas and protecting environmentally critical areas.

Specifically, the proposal would provide for the development of the approximately nine upland acres of the site (with structures sited within an approximately six-acre area), while reserving the balance of the site, roughly 115 acres, for uses consistent with habitat protection, such as wetland mitigation banking and trail connections.

2. Consistency with Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan, including the following sections as applicable:

a. Consistency with the goals contained in the Goals, Vision and Framework Policy Element.

- The proposal sets aside about 115 acres for permanent conservation and rehabilitation, consistent with the goal of protecting environmentally critical areas.
- It provides additional opportunities for recreation, consistent with the goal of enhancing Redmond’s quality of life.
- The proposal expands senior living opportunities and onsite living opportunities, and contemplates the use of van service for future residents of the community, consistent with emphasizing choices in housing and transportation.
- The proposal does not lie within Downtown or Overlake, but does contribute to the overall economic vitality of the City by providing easements for critical infrastructure links, new job opportunities, and the potential for partnerships with local universities.

b. Consistency with the preferred land-use pattern as described in the Land Use Element.

Policy FW-10 summarizes Redmond’s preferred land-use pattern. The policy explains that development should be directed away from “environmentally critical areas and important natural resources.” It also encourages “redevelopment of properties that are underutilized,” as well as “maintain[ing] and enhanc[ing] an extensive system of parks, trails, and open space.”

Consistent with FW-10, this proposal protects in perpetuity environmentally critical areas, allows for development on that portion of the site that is suitable for urban development, and allows for critical links to be completed in the Bear & Evans Creek Greenway System.

Furthermore, while the development of senior housing requires a Land Use Map amendment, the concept of trading higher density on the upland portion of the site for perpetual preservation of the balance of the site is already present in the existing Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan and implementing regulations. This Development Guide amendment provides both the applicant and the community with assurances about the type and intensity of proposed development.

Even so, the amendment would represent a change in the City’s Comprehensive Land-Use Map, which is one way that the City implements policies in the Land-Use Element. The Comprehensive Land-Use Map designates the property Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park while the applicant proposes, and the Technical Committee recommends, a change to Design District.

c. Consistency with Redmond’s community character objectives as described in the Community Character/Historic Preservation Element or elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Community Character/Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan describes Redmond as a “green city” that retains its small-town feel while accommodating urban growth. It does this by ensuring high quality building and site design in residential and commercial areas, preserving links to Redmond’s past, retaining small and local businesses, providing gathering places, and promoting public access to Redmond’s river and lake shores.

This proposal would permanently protect about 115 acres of open space, enhancing for future generations Redmond’s “green” identity. It would also enable the Redmond Parks Department to develop trail links, providing greater access to Redmond’s shorelines. Development resulting from this proposal would undergo design review in accordance with the design standards in place at the time of site development. Those design standards implement the policy of ensuring high quality building and site design.

d. RCDG Section 20F.40.60 specifies that amendments to the Redmond Community Development Guide that are subject to a Type VI process conform to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan. The following is an analysis of how this proposal conforms to Comprehensive Plan policy relating to land use, housing, and the Bear Creek neighborhood:

LU-59: Design District Designation

Purpose. Take advantage of opportunities for appropriate mixes of uses in suitable locations such as large parcels (totaling at least five acres in size) in a common ownership or the sites of major institutions, such as hospitals. Provide for preparation of master plans to promote unified development of an area or to meet the special needs of institutions while managing impacts on nearby uses. This designation is also intended to:

- *Provide flexibility in zoning that cannot be provided by other mechanisms.*
- *Allow the creation of policies and regulations that apply to specific sites.*
- *Apply to areas that are served or are capable of being served by transit.*

As part of designating new Design Districts, prepare a specific development plan or site plan for that area that:

- *Specifies the allowed uses, density, and any specific review requirements and standards required to adequately manage the Design District and to mitigate adverse impacts on the community, neighborhood, or environment;*
- *Reflects substantial public involvement from the neighborhood in which it is located;*

- *Meets the review process requirements of a plan amendment, when establishing the Design designation, or a rezone that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, if the designation already is applied to the property; and*
- *Is scheduled for review and update every five to 10 years.*

Allowed Uses. Implement this designation through the Design District zone. Allow for an appropriate mix of uses and structure types while ensuring that the designation supports the preferred land use pattern. Determine densities and intensities based on the suitability of the area for development.

The recommended action is consistent with this policy. The site is about 125 acres and is held almost entirely in common ownership. The applicant has prepared a conceptual site plan (Exhibit B) and accompanying regulations that describe the allowed uses and intensities of those uses, taking into account the impacts on neighbors and others. The area is currently served by Metro routes with destinations in Redmond, Kirkland, and Bellevue. The Technical Committee's recommended language includes a provision to review the zoning designation ten years after its adoption.

***NE-17:** Conserve and protect environmentally critical areas from loss or degradation. Maintain as open space hazardous areas and significant areas of steep slopes, undeveloped shorelines and wetlands.*

The proposed BCDD would set aside about 115 acres of riparian and wetland habitat near Bear and Evans Creeks while focusing development on upland portions of the District. Any resulting proposal would be required to comply with the City's Shoreline Master Program and Critical Areas Ordinance.

Based on environmental documentation submitted by the applicant, the proposal avoids structural development in the 100-year floodplain, near wetlands and near streams. It would restore a waterway currently in a pipe and culvert by day-lighting and enhancing it for the benefit of fish and wildlife. It also provides for the future relocation of Evans Creek away from industrial areas, which is expected to improve the creek's ecological functions and the ability of industrial property owners and tenants to use their land.

***LU-8:** Maintain development regulations to promote compatibility between uses; retain desired neighborhood character; ensure adequate light, air, and open space; protect environmental quality; and manage potential impacts on public facilities and services. Through these regulations address features including but not limited to:*

- *Impervious surface area and lot coverage.*
- *Building height, bulk, placement, and separation.*
- *Development intensity.*
- *Pedestrian access.*
- *Landscaping.*

The proposed BCDD regulations contain standards for all of the above except pedestrian access, which would be regulated by other portions of the Community Development Guide.

Building heights are limited to 48 feet, comparable with maximum heights in R-12. The tallest structures are located in the center of the developable area, with building heights proposed to decrease nearer to the edges of the developable area. Heights and setbacks were chosen with compatibility with neighboring properties and zones in mind.

Development intensity is regulated by floor area ratio (FAR), lot coverage, and impervious surface area limits. The lot coverage and impervious surface area limits for the developable portion of the site are similar to those in Redmond's multi-family residential zones. FAR for the developable portion is limited to 0.80, limiting total development to about 307,000 square feet of gross floor area.

CC-14: Identify public view corridors unique to Redmond such as those of Mt. Rainier, Mt. Baker, the Sammamish Valley, Lake Sammamish, the Sammamish River, the Cascade Mountains, and community landmarks and, when feasible, design streets, trails, parks, and structures to preserve and enhance those view corridors through such means as:

- Removal of invasive plants.
- Properly pruning trees and brush while including them as a part of the vista.
- Framing views with structural elements.
- Aligning paths to create focal points.
- Offering incentives to maintain public views when new development occurs.
- Requiring view corridors for new development.

The proposed Design District regulations specifically require that structures and other development impacts like parking are sited so as to preserve the view corridor from Avondale Road through the Keller Farm (see Exhibits A and D).

HO-21: Work with agencies, private developers and non-profit organizations to locate housing in Redmond intended to serve Redmond's special needs populations, particularly those with challenges related to age, health, or disability.

The proposal provides housing for seniors, including homes for those requiring assisted living and those living with Alzheimer's. Further, the applicant proposes to partner with local universities to offer internships in geriatrics at the resulting retirement community.

EV-8: Provide the land use capacity and development regulations that support the accommodation of a variety of housing styles, densities, sizes, and prices so those employed within Redmond may have the opportunity to live in Redmond as well as to increase the attractiveness of Redmond to those being sought to work in the City.

The applicant proposes to provide onsite housing for employees of the retirement living facility, creating an opportunity for residents to live near their place of employment.

PR-39: *Develop an interconnected trail system throughout the greater Redmond area in cooperation with local, State, and federal agencies and private organizations. Identify and develop a hierarchy of trails, based upon trail construction and function. Serve a variety of activities and abilities for both recreation and transportation, including pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrians, and other users in appropriate locations.*

The proposal will provide easements to enable the Parks Department to complete trails links as part of the Bear and Evans Creek Greenway System. Those trails in turn link to other local and regional trails, improving the overall quality of the local and regional trails network.

N-BC-2: *The existing rural and semi-rural character of the Bear Creek Neighborhood should be preserved.*

N-BC-4: *Opportunities for a diversity of people and lifestyles should be provided in the Bear Creek area.*

N-BC-7: *The existing significant natural features in the Bear Creek Neighborhood should be retained and enhanced.*

N-BC-8: *The natural drainage systems of Bear, Evans and Patterson Creeks should be restored, maintained and enhanced to protect water quality, preserve existing aquatic habitat, reduce public costs and prevent environmental degradation. Public improvements and private developments should not alter natural drainage systems without mitigating measures which eliminate increased risk of flooding and erosion, negative impacts on water quality and loss of aquatic or riparian habitat.*

N-BC-9: *An undisturbed corridor wide enough to maintain the natural biological and hydrological functions of streams should be preserved in all new developments in the Bear Creek Planning Area.*

N-BC-10: *Lot clustering should be required when necessary to protect the hydraulic and wildlife functions of the Bear, Evans and Patterson Creek systems and associated wetlands. Clustered development should locate on the non-sensitive portions of a site, be compatible with surrounding land uses and be designed to minimize surface water impacts. These environmental considerations may result in a lower density than otherwise allowed by zoning.*

N-BC-12: *New development should rehabilitate degraded stream channels and banks in the Bear, Evans and Patterson Creek drainages to prevent further erosion and water quality problems. Where conditions permit, the banks and channels should be restored to a natural state.*

***N-BC-13:** Stream channels in the Bear, Evans and Patterson Creek drainages should not be placed in culverts unless absolutely necessary for property access. To reduce disruption to streams and their banks, bridges should be used for stream crossings, and crossings should serve several properties. When culverts are required, oversized culverts with gravel bottoms that maintain the channels' width and grade should be used.*

The above policies relate to the preservation of natural features in the Bear Creek neighborhood. Especially pertinent to this proposal are policies related to the preservation and enhancement of the Bear and Evans Creek stream corridors.

The proposed zoning regulations would cluster urban levels of development on the upland portion of the site, away from environmentally critical areas and their buffers, consistent with the above policies. The regulations would reserve the balance of the site for agriculture, open space, passive recreation, trails, and wetland mitigation banking, consistent with policy statement regarding preservation of the character of the neighborhood.

Besides steering development away from environmentally critical areas, the permission of wetland mitigation banking would enable the habitat of those stream corridors and associated wetlands to be greatly enhanced.

3. Potential general impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources.

As shown in Exhibit D, the site contains Bear and Evans Creeks, both Class I streams, and a waterway in a pipe and culvert along the western boundary of the property. The site is also criss-crossed by irrigation ditches – not classified as critical areas – and is dotted with wetlands of various sizes. Furthermore, a portion of the site lies within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain and floodway for Bear and Evans Creeks. In sum, the environmental constraints of the site are considerable.

The proposed Performance Area 1 (PA-1), the approximately nine acres proposed for development, lies mostly outside of all environmentally critical areas and their protective buffers. The portion of PA-1 that would contain a fire access road (using an existing road) and recreational facilities is within the 100-year FEMA floodplain. The applicant would be required to provide compensatory flood storage, consistent with applicable laws and regulations. No structures are proposed to be sited within critical areas.

Performance Area 2 – the balance of the site – contains the bulk of the environmentally critical areas, and under the regulations that are proposed, would not allow for the development of any structures. Use would be limited to wetland mitigation banking, recreational facilities like trails, and agricultural crop production consistent with the

City's Critical Areas Ordinance and federal and state wetland mitigation banking rules. The allowed uses in BCDD(2) would preclude the development of structures permitted under the existing RA-5 zoning. Rather than resulting in detrimental impacts to land within PA-2, the Technical Committee believes that the limitation of land uses, together with the anticipated improvements to stream corridors, would result in significant environmental enhancements within PA-2.

Please refer to the attached environmental documentation for details.

4. Potential general impacts to the capacity of public facilities and services. For land-use related amendments, whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively and adequately at the proposed density/intensity.

Sewer, water. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment is anticipated to result in the development of approximately 155 retirement and onsite employee residences, with space for associated services. The development would gain sewer and water from the City of Redmond. The BCDD is located adjacent to developed land and could be reasonably served with water and sewer. It is not expected that a development of this nature and size would place an insurmountable burden on the sewer and water systems. In addition, the applicant is proposing to allow easements through the BCDD to allow a water system connection from Education Hill to Southeast Redmond.

Transportation. According to documentation submitted by the applicant, the proposed BCDD could eventually result in 29 AM and 44 PM new peak-hour trips per day. This is based on data from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition. Any development resulting from this Plan Amendment would be required to obtain a concurrency certificate prior to receiving development permits, and may also be required to complete a Transportation Management Plan.

Emergency Services. Demand for emergency services is anticipated to be that typically associated with proposed uses. The proposed development would include independent and assisted living with an Alzheimer's unit, but not skilled nursing.

5. Potential general economic impacts, such as impacts for business, residents, property owners, or City Government.

Impacts to business. The proposal, if it results in development, is expected to have a beneficial impact on existing businesses, as it will provide additional consumers. It is also expected to result in increased competition locally, as the retirement residences may be supplemented by on-site services for residents and guests such as financial, medical, and social services. Aegis's expected development is also likely to increase competition for senior housing customers (residents).

Impacts to residents. Economic impacts are not expected to accrue – positively or negatively – to residents on surrounding properties. Adverse impacts could result from the displacement of onsite residents, who number a handful or less.

Impacts to property owners. Presumably the current property owner anticipates some economic benefit since he allowed Aegis to bring forward this amendment. Surrounding property owners are not expected to experience substantial positive or negative economic impacts.

Impacts to City government. Development anticipated if this proposal is approved would create revenue and responsibilities for the City. The City would receive a portion of the property tax generated from new development, and would also receive a portion of the sales tax from items purchased on site, and from items purchased elsewhere in Redmond by residents or employees. Also, any future developer would be required to pay utility connection and service fees, as well as any applicable impact fees. The City would incur the marginal cost of maintaining public infrastructure used by those who live or work on site, in addition to providing non-fee-based City services.

- 6. For issues that have been considered within the last four annual updates, whether there has been a change in circumstances that makes the proposed amendment appropriate or whether the amendment is needed to remedy a mistake.**

While this issue has appeared on the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment docket in the past, this is the first time that the applicant has submitted materials for consideration by the Planning Commission.

The following items apply when proposed amendments concern allowed land uses or densities, such as proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan Map, land-use designations, allowed land uses, or zoning map.

- 7. General suitability of the area for the proposed land use or density, taking into account considerations such as adjacent land uses and the surrounding development pattern, and the zoning standards under the potential zoning classifications.**

Adjacent uses. Please see IV.A for a description of adjacent uses. In general, the uses to the west are of a similar development intensity as what is proposed for PA-1. Uses to the north are developed at a lower intensity, but the proposed regulations for bulk and massing are designed to ensure that the more intense development take place closer to the center of PA-1 and further from existing residences. PA-1 would be primarily residential, as are the uses around it. For those reasons, the Technical Committee concludes that the proposed uses and intensity of uses are appropriate for the site.

Surrounding development pattern. The proposed BCDD zone is surrounded by residential zones to the north, west, and east, and by office buildings, office parks, and some industrial uses to the south. The proposed BCDD would be primarily residential, incorporating both single-family and multi-family living. It is unlikely to have any impact on properties to the south and east since the development would be limited to the northwest corner of the site, where residential development already exists. The

inclusion of residential development, then, on the subject site, fits with the existing surrounding development pattern.

Zoning standards. The site is currently zoned RA-5, R-6, and BP. The following tables compare selected site standards among those zones.

Site Requirement	RA-5	R-6	BP
Allowed Density/Intensity	0.2 du/acre	6 du/acre	0.45 FAR
Front Setback (feet)	30	15	30
Side/Interior Setback (each side) (feet)	30	5/10	40
Side Street Setback (feet)	20	15	30
Rear Setback (feet)	30	10	20
Maximum Lot Coverage for Structures	2.5%	45%	75%
Maximum Impervious Surface Area	20%	65%	75%
Minimum Open Space (sf)	NS	20%	--
Maximum Height of Structures (feet)	35	35	45

Bear Creek Design District Zone Site Requirements Chart			
Site Requirement	PA-1		
Minimum Setback of Structures (in feet):			
Avondale Rd. NE: 1 & 2 story, 3 story, 4 story	15, 75, 150		
North property line: 1 & 2 story, 3 story, 4 story	10, 75, 100		
Other property lines: 1 & 2 story, 3 story, 4 story	10, 75, 100		
Maximum Height of Structures ^{1, 2, 3} (in feet/stories)	48’/4		
	PA-1	PA-2	Zone-wide
Maximum Floor Area Ratio:	0.80	0	0.057
Maximum Lot Coverage of Structures	30%	0%	2.49%
Maximum Impervious Surface ⁴	65%	0%	4.63%

Notes:

- 1) The maximum height of structures or portions of structures located above subsurface parking shall not include the distance between the finished grade of the subsurface parking surface and the structure, or the stories of the structure devoted to subsurface parking.
- 2) Structures located in the shoreline jurisdiction shall be limited to 30 feet in height.
- 3) The maximum height of structures limit denoted in the table above shall supercede restrictions in RCDG 20C.60.25-065.
- 4) The maximum impervious surface area allowed does not include impervious surface area that results from public trails planned as part of the Bear & Evans Creek Trail & Greenway.

As noted in IV.A, the site would current support 40 homes given the underlying zoning, and 215 homes using all available bonuses in the Bear Creek Neighborhood regulations. Those regulations stipulate that if a landowner clusters development on 29% or less of property under common ownership, dedicates trail right-of-way for the Bear and Evans Creek Greenway, and dedicates all remaining land as permanent open

space, the landowner may develop at six units per gross acre. That would equate to about 210 homes, plus five more on land not in common ownership.

According to the non-project SEPA checklist completed by the applicant, the number of proposed units under the BCDD proposal would total 155, while preserving about 93% of the land.

Environmental Suitability. As discussed elsewhere in this report, especially under item IV.B.3, this proposal explicitly takes into account the environmental constraints of the site, and is expected to result in the enhancement of the natural environment on 115 acres in the Bear Creek Basin.

8. Whether the proposed land-use designation, zoning, or uses are compatible with nearby land-use designations, zoning or uses. Whether there are opportunities to achieve compatibility with surrounding land uses through design or through separation by topography or buffers.

This issue is discussed in item IV.B.7 above. The proposal would allow for retirement residences, which are a use compatible with existing single- and multi-family residences in the area. Emerald Heights on Education Hill is a good example of where a retirement community coexists with single-family development. Also discussed above is the applicant's proposal to step-back the buildings from the property line as they increase in height. For example, any four-story portion of a building in PA-1 would require 100-foot setbacks at a minimum – 150 feet from Avondale Road.

9. Whether development will be directed away from environmentally critical areas and other important natural resources.

This issue is discussed under IV.B.3 in some detail. In sum, development is proposed to be directed away from environmentally critical areas while permanently protecting about 115 acres of stream corridor, wetlands, and other open spaces.

10. If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses or densities in an area:

a. The need and demand for the land uses that would be allowed and whether the change would result in the loss of capacity to accommodate other needed land uses, especially whether the proposed amendment complies with policy HO-16, the City's policy of no-net loss of housing capacity;

The land is currently designated for residential uses – this proposal would result in predominantly senior residential development with internal ancillary medical, financial, and social services. The current zoning would allow for between 40 and 215 homes, depending on the extent to which available bonuses are used. The BCDD is expected to accommodate 155 homes. Comparing the underlying zoning limits shows that the proposal would result in a net gain in dwellings, consistent with HO-16.

- b. Implications of the proposed amendment for the balance between the amount and type of employment in Redmond and the amount and type of housing in Redmond.**

Balance of employment types. In the medium- and long-term, the proposal is likely to contribute additional service sector jobs to the local economy. These jobs – spanning industries from healthcare to software – composed about 68% of jobs in Redmond in 2006. The applicant envisions employing about 74 full-time equivalents at build-out.

Balance of housing types. If the proposal results in the development of a retirement community consisting of single- and multi-family dwellings, the balance of housing types will shift subtly toward multi-family. The bigger impact will be on the total number of retirement dwellings available in Redmond. Currently, Redmond is home to about 832 retirement or convalescent units. This proposal would increase that amount by about 19%.

V. AUTHORITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL, PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

A. Process to Amend the Redmond Community Development Guide

RCDG Sections 20F.30.15 and 20F.30.55 require that amendments to the Comprehensive Plan be reviewed under the Type VI process. Under this process, the Planning Commission conducts a study session(s), an open record hearing(s) on the proposed amendment, and makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body for this process.

B. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

The Redmond Planning Commission and the Redmond City Council have subject matter jurisdiction to hear and decide whether to adopt the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and subsequent rezone.

C. Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

A SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued on April 16, 2007. The comment and appeal periods expired 4/30/07 and 5/15/07 respectively.

D. 60-Day State Agency Review

State agencies were sent 60-day notice of this proposed amendment on April 9, 2007.

E. Public Involvement

The applicant held a public open house on April 4, 2007. Invitations were mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the site. Comments received to date are attached in Exhibit E.

The public has opportunities to comment on the proposed amendment through the Planning Commission review process and its public hearing, scheduled for August 1, 2007. Comments can also be made directly to the City Council. A public notice was published in the Seattle Times on July 18, 2007. Notice was also sent to property owners within 500 feet, interested parties, and to state, federal, and tribal agencies with interests in riparian corridors and wetlands.

F. Appeals

RCDG 20F.30.55 identifies Development Guide Amendments as a Type VI permit. Final action is held by the City Council. The action of the City Council on a Type VI proposal may be appealed by filing a petition with the Growth Management Hearing Board pursuant to the board's requirements.

VI. LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Proposed Bear Creek Design District Regulations

Exhibit B: Conceptual Site Plan

Exhibit C: Aerial Photo

Exhibit D: SEPA Checklist with Attachments

Exhibit E: Public Comments

Robert G. Odle, Planning Director

Date

William J. Campbell, Interim Public Works Director

Date